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Implementation of planned park improvements is a critical aspect of planning. This has been a key community desire throughout the planning process and is the most important factor in gaining and keeping the public trust.

Most of the projects identified in this plan will be implemented through MPRB’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP charts a six-year plan for funding specific park projects. It is revised each year through a public process led by the MPRB Commissioners and staff. Beginning with the 2017-2022 CIP, MPRB implemented new racial equity and investment/condition measures to guide selected capital improvements. This is a requirement of the 20-Year Neighborhood Parks Plan (NPP20) an historic agreement between MPRB and the City of Minneapolis to fund the neighborhood parks at increased levels until 2037 (20 years from the inception of the agreement). Through this additional funding, many of the projects identified in the NSAMP will be considered for implementation based on the new project selection criteria.

When parks reach their funding year in the CIP a project is initiated and a project manager (PM) is assigned. That PM works with MPRB staff from various departments, as well as with community members, to determine the scope and schedule of the project, based on guidance from the master plan. This so-called “participatory project scoping” allows MPRB staff and community members to have a say in exactly what gets built and how the construction project is sequenced to minimize impact to the public and to operational needs. Essentially, a PM is given a budget (by the CIP) and an overall concept of the park (by the NSAMP) and works with stakeholders to decide what exactly to implement. For that reason, the NSAMP does not include prioritizations between parks or even of aspects of each park’s design. Prioritization is determined when a capital improvement project is initiated, allowing for community prioritization at the time of improvement.

Some NSAMP projects may be implemented in collaboration with outside agencies, including the City of Minneapolis and Minneapolis Public Schools, or community and nonprofit partners. In these cases, it is likely that non-MPRB funding will be brought to the table to implement projects identified in this plan. Such collaborations are encouraged, to further leverage MPRB funds for implementation.
Without consistent and regular tracking of implementation efforts, the importance of the planning process will be lost and the public trust will be broken.

To improve accountability and spur implementation, MPRB is developing a single checklist showing implementation status of the various improvements at every park in every master plan across the entire system. This implementation checklist will live in a digital format on the MPRB Planning Division network. In this form it can be updated regularly. It can also serve as a guide to work planning across Divisions. Some items on the implementation checklist will not be accomplished simply through a funding allocation and a design and construction project. Some require partnership with other agencies or community groups; some require policy assessment, land management tasks, or changes in maintenance practices; some can be accomplished with NPP20 rehabilitation funds; some can be accomplished by MPRB trades and in-house labor. Regardless of MPRB Division or outside partnership, all implementation will be documented on the checklist and reported at least annually to the MPRB Commissioners and general public.

MPRB Staff will complete the appropriate line item on the digital implementation checklist upon completion of a project or task. MPRB Planning staff will submit a current checklist to the MPRB Commissioners at least annually.
The cost to transform neighborhood parks is a critical element of this master plan. A realistic understanding of the project costs (all costs involved in design and construction) will help the MPRB to prioritize the many projects identified across the system. At this stage in the development of these projects, the costs are based on the preliminary design and planning for each site, detailed in Chapter 4.

The overall cost estimate is based on the park-by-park cost estimates included in Chapter 4. The cost estimates break the park plans down into logical “projects,” such as a wading pool, basketball court, or walking path rehabilitation. The unit prices are based on analysis of past construction projects and are priced at the base year of 2019. Capital improvement planning and budgeting for later years will require addition of an escalation factor.

These cost estimates are just that: estimates. Over the life of the NSAMP, construction practices, materials, design detailing, and labor costs will certainly change. At five year increments after adoption of the NSAMP, MPRB staff should revisit the unit prices that form the basis for these cost estimates and revise them if necessary.

In addition, the final cost of a park project is often determined by the details that are finalized or better understood in the latter stages of design—or even as the improvements are about to be constructed. Time also plays an important role as the cost of construction can vary with time due to inflationary factors as well as factors relating to construction activity and economic conditions. The costs presented in this master plan should be considered “planning level” and reflect 2019 dollars. That is, they are not based on final construction documents and they utilize assumptions about the cost to permit, mobilize, and prepare the park site for development. Significant contingencies (as a percentage of construction costs) have therefore been included for both design and construction, but will be refined as timing and plans become more definite.

The following figure summarizes the total cost of improvements for each park currently included in this master plan. Costs for replacing ALL assets in the park plans are included in the estimates, even if the asset is in good condition and will not be relocated. The assumption is that during the 20-30 year life of the NSAMP, ALL assets will be replaced. Project-by-project cost estimates are included in the “park packets” in Chapter 4. Costs are separated into neighborhood, regional, and total amounts. Note that the neighborhood estimate includes those projects within Shingle Creek Regional Trail that are primarily neighborhood facilities (such as pickleball courts, wading pool, and athletic fields).
THE COST ESTIMATE AND IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST HAVE A STANDARD SERIES OF COLUMNS:

- **Park Name** refers to the park in which a project will take place. Projects without a specific park are noted in this column as “North Service Area.”
- **Asset Type** refers to one of seven categories of improvement: Aquatics, Play, Athletics, Courts, Winter, Landscape, and Other
- **Project** is a description of the improvement.
- **2019 Estimated Cost** is the estimated dollar amount to implement the project, and includes design, construction, contingency, and incidental costs like turf establishment, demolition, and associated pathways.

**Notes on Cost Estimates for MPRB Staff**

- Costs incidental to a project (including turf restoration, demolition, fencing, etc.) are included in the estimated project cost.
- Furniture and other amenities (including signs, benches, tables, etc.) are included in the “Miscellaneous signs, landscaping, furniture” line item for each park, as a percentage of the total other investment in that park. Capital improvement planning may want to include additional funds for other amenities to be implemented along with major projects.
- Items included in the ADA Transition Plan are not specifically tabulated in the cost estimates and are not shown in detail on the plans. Project managers involved in projects in North Service Area parks should review the ADA Transition Plan and consider adding complementary improvements to their projects.
### THE COST ESTIMATE TOTAL BY NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>2019 Estimate</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>cost per acre</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnes Place Triangle</td>
<td>$29,580</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>$51,894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett's Creek</td>
<td>$9,278,916</td>
<td>70.25</td>
<td>$132,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethune</td>
<td>$5,300,977</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>$430,974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohanon Field</td>
<td>$4,826,331</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>$567,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr Meadows</td>
<td>$12,344,444</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>$239,698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$5,213,944</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,042,789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>$1,020,065</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$2,040,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farview</td>
<td>$8,282,522</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$394,406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farwell</td>
<td>$1,396,586</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$1,163,822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folwell</td>
<td>$8,701,660</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$322,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Gale</td>
<td>$1,844,365</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$1,317,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>$5,900,517</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$983,419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>$7,344,544</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>$1,064,427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Greenway</td>
<td>$156,870</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$78,435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Triangle</td>
<td>$36,513</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$365,130</td>
<td>No cost, agreement with user group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Triangle</td>
<td>$4,323,549</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>$1,191,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>$1,083,432</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$833,410</td>
<td>No cost, managed by neighborhood organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Triangle</td>
<td>$109,411</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>$781,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell Square</td>
<td>$21,043,602</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>$825,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Triangle</td>
<td>$22,413</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>$448,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Commons</td>
<td>$2,125,995</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>$565,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Triangle</td>
<td>$834,563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$834,563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Hill</td>
<td>$1,713,662</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$244,809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Lake</td>
<td>$19,963,290</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$307,128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle Creek *</td>
<td>$2,442,171</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>$511,986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner Field</td>
<td>$1,484,554</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>$84,832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View</td>
<td>$3,780,707</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>$1,608,811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory</td>
<td>$831,659</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$118,808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Prairie Dog Park</td>
<td>$2,846,390</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$406,627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber</td>
<td>$3,494,516</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$698,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAMP NEIGHBORHOOD TOTAL</td>
<td>$131,436,843</td>
<td>365.22</td>
<td>$359,884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shingle Creek Regional Trail is included because it has neighborhood amenities
USING THIS DOCUMENT FOR IMPLEMENTATION

This document is intended to be used by MPRB staff, elected officials, and the general public as a resource to implementation. It is a guide for future designers, elected officials, and partners.

USING THIS DOCUMENT FOR PROJECT DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

Once a project is funded and a project manager is assigned, that project manager shall consult the resources contained in this document as a basis for participatory project scoping. This document shall govern the type of asset to be constructed (natural play v. traditional play; wading pool v. splash pad) as well as its general location and size. All park plans are available in CAD. These files can be overlain on a surveyed base to guide detailed design. During the project scoping and detailed design process, project managers should:

- Communicate clearly with the community about the parameters set forth in this master plan and the level of decision-making and input community members can have
- Consult with the community to prioritize elements within these master plans for initial implementation
- Verify that any known land use issues have been resolved by first checking the “park packet” to see if their park has any, and then referencing the implementation checklist to ensure completion, where applicable
- Examine all projects in the list for their park, to consider if other leveraging opportunities exist, through grants, private fundraising, park dedication fees, or other funding sources

USING THIS DOCUMENT IN PARTNERSHIPS WITH OUTSIDE AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND NONPROFITS

It is likely that portions of this master plan will be implemented in partnership with outside groups. There is significant community interest in certain elements of these designs. Partnerships in funding and implementation are encouraged, but they should be guided by the plans contained in this document. During discussions with potential outside partners, MPRB staff should clearly communicate that ONLY items contained in this document will be considered for partnership, in respect for the community priorities in these neighborhood parks.
USING THIS DOCUMENT TO GUIDE EXPENDITURES OF PARK DEDICATION FEES

MPRB collects park dedication fees from all development projects within the City of Minneapolis, with some exemptions and exceptions. These fees—in most cases—must be spent within the neighborhood they were generated. They must be spent on NEW park amenities and cannot generally be used for like-for-like replacement. There are many new proposals in this master plan that would be eligible for park dedication funding. In fact, because this plan is the community's guide to park implementation, park dedication fees should almost always be directed toward implementation of this plan. Park dedication fees are allocated through the CIP process and are most effective when they leverage existing capital projects. Therefore, CIP planners should use this plan as a guide during the CIP process to consider options for park dedication fee allocation. In addition, the general public should use this document as a guide to making suggestions on allocation. In addition, the general public should use this document as a guide to making suggestions on allocation.
In order to remain a living, useful document for future park planners, designers, elected officials, partners, and community members, the NSAMP must be able to change when necessary. Any departure from the guiding principles and plans contained in this document must be accomplished by an action of the elected Board of Commissioners according to applicable policies and procedures. The affected community should also be involved in that decision-making, per MPRB community engagement policy.

There are several likely reasons that the NSAMP will need to be amended. The following checklists outline the tasks necessary to amend and update the NSAMP. It is critical that NSAMP documents and resources are updated after amendment approval, so MPRB staff and the general public have only the most up-to-date plans. Appropriate MPRB staff shall perform the tasks in the applicable checklist when an amendment is contemplated.

**AMENDMENT AS A RESULT OF REQUEST**

Because the park plans in the NSAMP assume the existing footprints of recreation centers (or propose very tentative building changes), any planned modification to recreation center buildings will impact the design of the park. In the case of a recreation center expansion, reconstruction, or decommissioning, the NSAMP must be amended.

- Refer to the community engagement summary in this document for the park in question, to understand the baseline community desires at the time of the NSAMP.
- Engage with the community around and users of the park to determine how the park design should change to accommodate changes in the recreation center. Follow MPRB community engagement policy.
- Achieve MPRB Commissioner approval for the modified park plan
- Modify park plan in CAD and replace CAD basemap in network park folder
- Modify and update digital cost and maintenance estimates
- Modify park narrative sections to reflect new design, and note date and reason for amendment
- Replace PDF park packet in network park folder and main NSAMP document
- Modify overall service area facilities map and spreadsheet, if park change adds or removes planned facilities, and replace in main NSAMP document
- Update the digital implementation tracking form, if change adds or removes planned facilities
AS A RESULT OF DETAILED SITE DESIGN
It is possible that, during detailed design, unknowns will come to light that require modifications to locations of elements within the park. Such modifications should be the result of actual site conditions that prevent implementation of the plan as drawn, not merely a desire to depart from the plan. Amendment is not necessary for moderate to minor changes in location or size of amenities. Amendment is necessary if any planned amenity would be eliminated, a new facility added, or a planned facility fundamentally altered in its recreational potential or purpose, such as a change between full and half court basketball, or between a wading pool and splash pad. In such cases, the NSAMP must be amended, with the amendment coming forward for approval concurrent with approval of the schematic design that forced the amendment.

• Achieve MPRB Commissioner approval for the modified park plan
• Modify park plan in CAD and replace CAD basemap in network park folder
• Modify and update digital cost and maintenance estimates
• Modify park narrative sections to reflect new design, and note date and reason for amendment
• Replace PDF park packet in network park folder and main NSAMP document

BY ADDING DESIGNATED URBAN AGRICULTURE AREAS
The neighborhood park plans serve as the official designation of urban agriculture areas in the MPRB system. When urban agriculture areas are added, removed, or modified, the NSAMP must be amended.

• Achieve MPRB Commissioner approval for the modified park plan(s)
• Modify urban agriculture designation on park plan(s)
• Modify park narrative sections to reflect new design(s), and note date and reason for amendment
• Replace PDF park packet(s) in network park folder and main NSAMP document
• Modify overall service area facilities map and spreadsheet, and replace in main NSAMP document
• Update the digital implementation tracking form, if change adds or removes planned facilities
• Add the note “Amended, Month/Year” to the cover of the NSAMP document
• Add the signed amendment resolution to Appendix Z
APPENDICES*

A. CAC Meeting Notes + Presentations  
B. PAC Meeting Notes  
C. Existing Facility Analysis  
D. Demographics/Urban Form  
E. Community Engagement Summary  
F. Community Connectors Final Reports  
G. Initial Concepts  

Z. Approval Tabulation & Board Action

*The Appendices are not included in the printed document nor on the project website. This background information is contained in approximately one thousand pages of documents, making it cost-prohibitive and cumbersome to produce and store. Appendices may be made available for review via e-mail transmittal by requesting them from the project manager.

Visit minneapolisparks.org/currentprojects and select North Service Area Master Plan to find applicable contact information.